



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,736	06/18/2001	Michael Glotzer	0652.2260001/EKS/AES	8755

26111 7590 04/17/2003

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LI, RUIXIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1646

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,736

Applicant(s)

GLOTZER ET AL.

Examiner

Ruixiang Li

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicants' election with traverse of Group VII (claims 7-11), drawn to methods of identifying a compound capable of modulating cytokinesis, in Paper No. 9 filed on 12/02/2002 is acknowledged.
2. Further restriction of claims 7-11 to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 7 (in part), 8-10, drawn to a method for identifying a compound capable of modulating cytokinesis, wherein the compound's ability to modulate the function of CYK-4 is determined, classified in class 436, subclass 64.
  - II. Claims 7 (in part) and 11, drawn to a method for identifying a compound capable of modulating cytokinesis, wherein the compound's ability to inhibit MKLP1 function is determined by determining the compound's ability to interfere with the biochemical multimerization of a member of the MKLP1 subfamily, classified in class 436, subclass 64.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instant case, the two inventions are drawn to completely different methods because Invention I requires measuring the compound's ability to modulate the function of

Art Unit: 1646

CYK-4, whereas Invention II requires measuring the compound's ability to interfere with the biochemical multimerization of a member of the MKLP1 subfamily. Each method is unique and not required by the other.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for a single group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
5. Furthermore, it is noted that the instant application discloses a human polypeptide CYK-4 set forth in SEQ ID NO: 2 and a murine CYK4 polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4. Each individual sequence represents a structural and functionally distinct entity that is capable of supporting a separate patent. The search and consideration of more than a single sequence constitutes an undue search burden on the office, given the ever-increasing size of the database.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of an amino acid sequence that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

6. Claim 8 recites "members of the Rho family GTPases", whereas claims 9 and 11 recite "a member of the MKLP1 subfamily". Each species (member) is a distinct

Art Unit: 1646

chemical entity and has a distinct structure from the others, and each requires a separate search of the prior art considerations.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

7. Claims 9 and 10 in Group I also are directed to patentably distinct species: (i) the compound's ability to inhibit CYK-4 function is determined by determining the compound's ability to interfere with the biochemical interaction of CYK-4 and a member of the MKLp1 subfamily; (ii) the compound's ability to inhibit CYK-4 function is determined by determining the compound's ability to interfere with the biochemical multimerization of CYK-4. The two species reflect completely different biological activities which are not interchangeable and which require non-cohesive searches and considerations.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1646

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02 (a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48 (b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48 (b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (I).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruixiang Li whose telephone number is (703) 306-0282. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 1646


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (703) 308-6564. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [yvonne.eyler@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Ruixiang Li  
Examiner  
April 7, 2003

  
YVONNE EYLER, PH.D.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600